

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0191/01 0581655
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O R 271655Z FEB 10
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0521
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0324
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0394
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0398
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0394

S E C R E T GENEVA 000191

SIPDIS
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/27
TAGS: [PARM](#) [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#)
SUBJECT: SFO-GVA-VIII: (U) DEFINITIONS WORKING GROUP MEETING,
FEBRUARY 23, 2010

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose E. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

[1](#)1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VIII-075.

[1](#)2. (U) Meeting Date: February 23, 2010

Time: 4:00 P.M. - 5:15 P.M.

Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

[1](#)3. (S) At the Definitions Working Group meeting co-chaired by Mr. Siemon and ADM (Ret) Kuznetsov on February 23, the sides discussed Russian-proposed language for treaty Article IV, paragraph 8, that revised the locational restriction for non-deployed heavy bombers. The sides also agreed on the following terms: "nuclear armaments," "heavy bomber equipped for nuclear armaments," "heavy bomber equipped for non-nuclear armaments," "non-deployed launcher of ICBMs," "non-deployed launcher of SLBMs," "rocket motor case," "solid rocket motor," "solid-fueled ICBM," and "solid-fueled SLBM." The sides briefly noted five other terms that remained for discussion in the near future. End summary.

14. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Article IV Regarding Non-Deployed Heavy Bombers; and Terms and Definitions Discussed.

----- --
ARTICLE IV REGARDING NON-DEPLOYED HEAVY BOMBERS
----- --

15. (S) Kuznetsov handed over a copy of a paper that had been provided by the Russian delegation during an Expanded Ad Hoc meeting earlier that day, with a proposal for Article IV, paragraph 8, on locational restrictions for non-deployed heavy bombers.

Begin text:

18. Non-deployed heavy bombers shall be based only at heavy bomber flight test centers and shall be located only at repair or production facilities for heavy bombers.

End text.

16. (S) Kuznetsov explained that the proposal built on direction from the Russian Head of Delegation and on the definition for non-deployed heavy bomber that had been nearly agreed in the Definitions Working Group. He also noted that some slight changes to the previous version of this text had been made at Moscow's direction. He drew the attention of the U.S. delegation to the concept that the non-deployed heavy bombers were "located" at repair facilities, not "based" there. They would, Kuznetsov said, remain attributed to the airbase from which they had come.

17. (S) Kuznetsov pointed out that it was not important when the bomber switched from one category of the database to another since there would be a notification to that effect. He clarified that a movement notification would be provided when the heavy bomber went to the repair facility; the notification would include a comment indicating the change in its deployed status.

18. (S) Siemon remarked that the U.S. delegation had initially considered using the term "located" for the restriction, but had decided that "based" was more accurate. Siemon concurred ON the provision of a notification for the movement of the heavy bomber to or from the repair facility. But, Siemon continued, using the criteria of where the heavy bomber was "based" provided a clearer picture of what would be going on with the bombers. He illustrated his point, saying that if there was a bomber that left Minot for a repair facility, the inventory of heavy bombers at Minot would go down by one and the inventory at the repair facility would go up by one. Doing so would reflect that the heavy bomber was "based" at the repair facility. "Based" was more permanent than "located." Moreover, for the U.S. side, heavy bombers would be in repair for a long time. Kuznetsov added that the period of repair was longer for Russian heavy bombers than for U.S. bombers.

19. (S) Kuznetsov continued that each air base had a unit of heavy bombers; a heavy bomber went from the production facility to its airbase, where it would be attributed for some dozen years although, he acknowledged, whole units sometimes moved to other airbases. Some regular repair or maintenance could be conducted at the air base; however, heavy bombers would sometimes go to the

repair facility for longer term repair that could last a year. During that period, it would remain attributed to its home air base and would be only provisionally at the repair facility. Russia wanted to be able to remove that heavy bomber from accountability under the deployed delivery vehicle and warhead limits. It would also not be subject to inspection, he asserted, because it would be non-deployed. After the end of the maintenance period, the heavy bomber would return to its home air base. Maybe in the U.S. system, Kuznetsov observed, the heavy bomber would go to a different air base than the one at which it had started.

¶10. (S) Kuznetsov stated that the repair and production facilities would, of course, be listed in the database. If some heavy bombers were at those facilities, the database would reflect them as being there. When the repair was completed, the heavy bombers would go

back and appropriate notifications would be provided.

¶11. (S) Siemon asked whether the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) data for the air base would be reduced when the heavy bomber went to the repair facility, or would the heavy bomber stay listed in the database as being based at the air base? Kuznetsov said the bomber would go to the repair facility. Mr. Dean cautioned about changing the deployed status of a bomber every time it moved to another facility. Kuznetsov reiterated that when the repair was done, the bomber would go back to the air base and not be permanently at the repair facility.

¶12. (S) Before ending this part of the meeting, Siemon sought clarification that the new Russian proposal did not affect the agreed definitions of deployed or non-deployed heavy bomber. Kuznetsov provided a paper with slightly revised definitions, showing that "test heavy bomber" had not changed, but "deployed heavy bomber" and "non-deployed heavy bomber" had changed and included "located" instead of "based" at a repair facility. Siemon said the U.S. delegation would respond to the proposal promptly.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS DISCUSSED

¶13. (S) Turning back to definitions, Kuznetsov quickly indicated that the Russian delegation could agree to drop the reference to the range of 600 kilometers for air-to-surface missiles as proposed by the U.S. side and the sides agreed to the following definitions:

Begin text:

The term "nuclear armaments" means, for heavy bombers, long-range nuclear ALCMs, nuclear air-to-surface missiles, or nuclear bombs.

The term "heavy bomber equipped for nuclear armaments" means a heavy bomber equipped for long-range nuclear ALCMs, nuclear air-to-surface missiles, or nuclear bombs.

The term "heavy bomber equipped for non-nuclear armaments" means a heavy bomber that is not equipped for long-range nuclear ALCMs,

nuclear air-to-surface missiles, or nuclear bombs.

End text.

¶14. (S) Kuznetsov also announced that, since the sides had agreed to the definition of soft-site launcher, the Russian delegation could agree to the following terms:

Begin text:

The term "non-deployed launcher of ICBMs" means an ICBM test launcher, an ICBM training launcher, an ICBM launcher located at a space launch facility, or an ICBM launcher, other than a soft-site launcher, that does not contain a deployed ICBM.

The term "non-deployed launcher of SLBMs" means an SLBM launcher, other than a soft-site launcher, which is used for testing or training, or an SLBM launcher that does not contain a deployed SLBM.

End text.

¶15. (S) Kuznetsov also gave Russian concurrence and the sides agreed to the following terms:

Begin text:

The term "rocket motor case" means the casing of an ICBM or SLBM that remains when the propellant is removed.

The term "solid rocket motor" means that part of the stage that consists of the case filled with solid propellant.

End text.

¶16. (S) For the following terms, Kuznetsov stated that the Russian side wanted to separate the definition into two terms instead of using "or" and the sides agreed to the following:

Begin text:

The term "solid-fueled ICBM" means an ICBM for which the stages are equipped with solid rocket motors.

The term "solid-fueled SLBM" means an SLBM for which the stages are equipped with solid rocket motors.

End text.

¶17. (S) Siemon and Kuznetsov jointly reviewed the remaining agenda for the Definitions Working Group by running through a few remaining terms that would be discussed at a future meeting: "submarine base," "relocation," "ICBM base," "basing area," and "launch" versus "flight test."

¶18. (U) Documents provided:

- Russia:

-- Russian proposal for Article III, paragraph 8, dated February 23, in Russian and unofficial English.

-- Russian proposal for definitions of deployed heavy bomber, non-deployed heavy bomber, and test heavy bomber, dated February 23, in Russian and unofficial English.

¶19. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Siemon

Lt Col Comeau

Mr. Connell

Mr. Dean

Mr. Hanchett

Mr. Taylor

Ms. Zdravecky (RO)

Ms. C. Smith (Int)

RUSSIA

ADM Kuznetsov

Ms. Fuzhenkova

Mr. Kamenskiy

Ms. Komshilova (Int)

¶20. (U) Gottemoeller sends.
KING